DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 693 CE 012 291

AUTHOR Piefer, Alan
TITLE A Foundation's Story: The First Seventy-Five Years of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
INSTITUTION Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 32p.; Reprinted from the Annual Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for the Year Ended June 30, 1979.
AVAILABLE FROM The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036 (single copies free).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; Consultation Programs; Educational Development; *Educational History; Educational Research; *Higher Education; Nonprofit Organizations; *Organizational Change; *Philanthropic Foundations; *Private Agencies; Public Policy; Retirement Benefits; Retrenchment
IDENTIFIERS Carnegie Commission on Higher Education; Carnegie Corporation; *Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching

ABSTRACT

The history of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT) is traced. Three eras are described: 1905 to 1930, a period of initial creativity and influence; 1930 to 1966, a period of gradual decline, leading eventually to loss of independence and virtual extinction; and 1966 to 1979, a period of revitalization. Originally, CFAT was primarily an organization concerned with the the administration of a pension program, but by 1930 it provided an informal and highly useful consultative service. Various initiatives were undertaken to deal with a deficit on free pension commitments, and although the years from about 1930 to 1966 were ones of retrenchment and gradual decline in the CFAT's affairs, there were significant achievements, including the Pennsylvania Study, which gave impetus to objective testing to measure educational attainment; the development of the Graduate Record Examinations; and a cooperative effort with other organizations that formed the Educational Testing Service. The relationship of the CFAT and the Carnegie Corporation of New York also is traced, along with the output of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, which was sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation, through the foundation. The influence of the commission on the development of public policy toward higher education and its influence on policy and practice on specific campuses are considered. The success of the commission revealed the CFAT, its sponsor, had an important role in the new era of American higher education and that it should continue to exist. Organizational and financial steps that were taken to facilitate the foundation's work are described. (SW)

ED208693

A Foundation's Story:

The First Seventy-Five Years of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

437 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10022

by Alan Pifer, President

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Reprinted from the 1978-1979 Annual Report

A Foundation's Story:

The First Seventy-Five Years of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

This is my final report as president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT), a position I have held since 1965, including two initial years as acting president. In 1977, looking toward the retirement in January 1980 of Clark Kerr, who has provided program leadership for the Foundation, beginning in 1967 as chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and since 1973 as chairman of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, it seemed advisable to me to tell the trustees I would bow out at about the same time, thereby enabling the trustees to recruit to the presidency someone to replace both Mr. Kerr and myself. Such an appointment would also terminate the practice, in effect since 1954, wherein the president of Carnegie Corporation of New York also served as president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This arrangement, essential when instituted, had become less compelling as the result of the successful revitalization of the CFAT, and the time seemed at hand to bring it to a close.

My resignation as president of the Foundation, therefore, takes effect at the close of this year's annual meeting in November 1979. At that time, Ernest Boyer, until recently U.S. Commissioner of Education and prior to that chancellor of the State University of New York, will take over the presidency. In January of 1980 he will also assume Mr. Kerr's responsibilities. I could not be more pleased at the selection of Mr. Boyer by the board of trustees. I have long admired his great qualities of mind and lively imagination, and I predict that he will lead the Foundation to new heights of distinction.

A Personal Assessment

The history of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching can be roughly divided into three eras: 1905 to 1930, a period of initial creativity, vigor and influence; 1930 to 1966, a period of gradual decline, leading eventually to loss of independence and virtual extinction; and 1966 to 1979, a period of revitalization, resulting in regained independence and new creativity and influence. The character of these three eras reflects the Foundation's varying financial fortunes during them—strong at the beginning, weak in the middle, and viable again at the end.

As I look back over the Foundation's 75-year history, several general observations occur to me. First, I am impressed by the nature of the relationship that has existed between the CFAT and Carnegie Corporation of New York. While each organization has over the years been a constant factor in the life of the other, their relationship has varied considerably. At times it has been one in which one organization considered itself senior in prestige and experience to the other; at times it has been one between equals, and at times virtually one between master and bondsman. At times it has been happy but at other times acrimonious and unpleasant. In general, however, the relationship has been an immensely productive one in which the talents and resources of the two organizations have been interwoven and deployed together to produce results that neither foundation could have achieved alone.

Initially the relationship was not based on a close commonality of interests but rather on an assumption that Mr. Carnegie had intended the Corporation to serve as a primary source of financial support for the Foundation when the latter needed it (and similarly for other Carnegie-established organizations). Then, as the Corporation developed its own interests in the 1920s and 1930s and these coincided only in part with the interests of the Foundation, the assumption that the more heavily endowed Corporation had a residual responsibility for the Foundation's welfare became a source of growing irritation and conflict between them. Since 1966, however, a joint concern for the welfare of higher education has provided a solid basis for cooperation.

I sincerely hope that the two foundations will find ways of working together constructively in the future for the benefit of higher education. Nevertheless, totally independent of one another now both structurally and

financially for the first time in over 60 years, they will have nothing *binding* them together. Their relationship from here on will have to be based entirely on common interests and mutual respect—which is as it should be.

The second comment I would make is that I am impressed, despite its somewhat arid middle years, with how much the CFAT has accomplished during its history, given its limited resources and small size. As one reviews this history, it becomes apparent that the Foundation was present, exerting significant influence, at a number of critical junctures in higher education's development over the past seven decades. Its record, I believe, is one of which all who have been associated with the organization, either as trustees or staff, can be justifiably proud. Certainly I am proud to have been able to play some part in the revitalization of the Foundation during the past fifteen years.

The CFAT's record of valuable service to the nation simply confirms to me again the enormous importance to our type of democratic society of having independent private organizations and institutions which can seek the truth in their own way and proclaim it fearlessly as they see it. Like many other such organizations, the CFAT has been bitterly criticized in its time. It has even been accused of being "disloyal" to higher education because it did not conform to the prevailing orthodoxy of the establishment and of being too influential with those who legislate and execute public policy. "Disloyal" it may have seemed in the heat of battle, but over the longer run the public policies it has espoused have, I believe, well served the self-interest of higher educational institutions in addition to the broader public interest in them.

As for the Foundation's influence, this has resulted solely from the timeliness and persuasiveness of the ideas it has put forward and the expert analysis and marshaling of data with which it has supported them. Even where financial backing from the Corporation has made possible experimental testing of an idea, as with the creation of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, this has still, over the longer run, had to meet the test of public acceptability, and acceptability within the academic community, to survive. In this light, the charge that the Foundation has been "too influential" has always struck me as nonsensical.

Finally, in reviewing the Foundation's history I am impressed with the

enormous difference two extraordinary men, Henry Pritchett and Clark Kerr, have made to its record of accomplishment. Pritchett of course I can judge only through the historical record and through his writings, but Clark Kerr I have known intimately and worked closely with for thirteen years. With his encyclopedic knowledge of higher education, his keen analytical skills, his judgment, his imagination, his unusual powers of exposition and his great sense of fairness, the leadership he has given to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, through them to the Foundation, and beyond them to higher education at large, has been truly remarkable. It has been a rare experience and uncommon privilege for me to be associated with him, and I am deeply grateful for the opportunity.

For those of us who have served both foundations, especially Florence Anderson, Thomas Bergin, Alden Dunham, Idalia Holder, David Robinson and Richard Sullivan, our responsibilities to the Corporation have always loomed larger than our responsibilities to the Foundation, simply because this has been the way we have been obliged to allot our time. Nonetheless, we have been loyal to the Foundation, have been scrupulous in not allowing its interests to be subordinated to those of the Corporation and have worked hard at its affairs. We hand it over now to Ernest Boyer and the new staff he will be assembling perhaps with some sense of loss but certainly without any regrets and with great confidence in the future. It is time for the fourth era in the Foundation's history to start, and we welcome it.

The Pritchett Years, 1905-1930

Viewed through the mist of time, the period during which the autocratic and opinionated but highly imaginative and intelligent Henry Pritchett held sway over the Foundation emerges as one of quite considerable achievement. The years from 1905 to 1919 were also, of course, ones during which another remarkable man, Andrew Carnegie, took an active interest in the Foundation. He and Pritchett lived within a few doors of each other on East 91st Street in New York City and conferred frequently. Of totally different backgrounds, they had much in common in their intellectual vigor, inventiveness of mind and determination to prevail in any controversy—a situation that both found themselves in with some regularity and, one

suspects, enjoyment. Together they designed the Foundation and gave it new directions when circumstances made this necessary.

It was Mr. Carnegie who first conceived of an organization to provide free pensions to college and university professors. Becoming a trustee of Cornell University in 1890, he was astonished to learn of the low salaries paid to the teaching staff and appalled at the poverty in which the typical retired professor was obliged to live. With the high respect for the teaching profession of one who had himself enjoyed little formal education, he saw this as a major injustice. By 1905 he was ready to do something about it, and in that year he asked the State of New York to charter a new private organization which he endowed with $10,000,000, the income from which was to provide free pensions to retiring teachers at private, non-sectarian institutions. This organization was simply called The Carnegie Foundation. To its board of trustees Mr. Carnegie recruited some of the most distinguished college and university presidents of the day, including such men as Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, Woodrow Wilson of Princeton and Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia.

Most importantly, he had enlisted in the planning of the new enterprise Henry Pritchett, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who was duly elected president of the Foundation at the first board meeting. Pritchett, seeing in the new organization a possible means of bringing order into the chaotic state of higher education that had ensued from its rapid development in the final quarter of the 19th century, persuaded Mr. Carnegie to seek a new, Congressional charter with expanded purposes. This effort proved successful and on March 10, 1906, President Theodore Roosevelt signed an Act of Congress incorporating The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, "in general to do and perform all things necessary to encourage, uphold and dignify the profession of the teacher and the cause of higher education within the United States, the Dominion of Canada, and Newfoundland . . . ," in addition, of course, to providing the free pensions specified in the 1905 charter.

Although there were 615 institutions of higher education listed by the U.S. Bureau of Education in 1905, the vast majority of these were sectarian and had exceedingly low standards. Material presented by Pritchett and Frank Vanderlip at the first board meeting suggested that

7

there were only 112 private, nonsectarian colleges and universities deemed suitable for further investigation. Of these, the 105 which had replied to a questionnaire indicated a total complement of only 2,653 professors. Individual salaries ranged widely but averaged $1,800. On the basis of these figures, an annual income for the Foundation of $500,000 was considered more than adequate to support a system of free pensions to all qualified professors at age 65 or after 30 years service, if these were limited in size to half the average salary earned over the final five years of employment. A further $5 million that was committed to the endowment in 1908 enabled Mr. Carnegie to realize his original intention of including public universities in the system.

An immediate problem that had to be faced after the trustees decided to deal primarily with institutions rather than individuals was the lack at the time of any clear definition of a college. The standards of many institutions were abysmally low and the dividing line between higher and secondary education was, to say the least, obscure, with many institutions operating at both levels and others, although called colleges, being little more than high schools. It was agreed therefore, somewhat arbitrarily, that, to qualify, an institution in addition to being nonsectarian must have a minimum endowment of $200,000 and a faculty of at least six full-time professors and maintain certain minimum entrance requirements.

It was the last of these criteria that over the years caused the Foundation to be much villified. A powerful mythology arose which had the Foundation, through imposition of the "Carnegie Unit", serving as a "standardizing agency" that rigidified college entrance requirements and thereby denied to colleges and universities the ability to experiment with more flexible measurements of a student's preparation for higher education. In fact, the idea of units of secondary work serving as criteria for college entry had been in use for some years. When the foundation stated in 1906 that a unit signified "a course of five recitations weekly throughout an academic year of high school," it was only conforming to the existing practice of the better institutions and examining boards. The first 45 colleges admitted to the Foundation's list had no problem in meeting the minimum requirement of 14 units for admission and some required as many as 16.

The Foundation was far from being alone in defining a standard unit. The National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Prepar-

atory Schools was formed in 1906 to consider requirements for admission and other matters. It was composed of seven national and regional associations including the College Entrance Examination Board, plus the Carnegie Foundation, and the U.S. Commissioner of Education as an *ex-officio* member. At its 1908 meeting, the definition of the unit was discussed at length. Following the meeting, a conference was held between representatives of the Committee and officers of the Foundation, and the following statement was agreed upon: "A unit represents a year's study in any subject in a secondary school, constituting approximately a quarter of a full year's work." A year's work was described in a parenthesis. This definition was published in the Foundation's 1909 report and endorsed by the College Entrance Examination Board and most of the regional associations. Because of the influence of the Foundation and the number of institutions which raised their entrance requirements to qualify for its pension plan, it was but a short step to the units being labeled "Carnegie Units."

Pritchett, however, frequently expressed his concern that the unit was being too rigidly interpreted. And writing in the 1934 annual report, Henry Suzzallo, then president of the Foundation, and staff member William Learned described the history of the unit and went on to state: "Today, none recognizes more clearly than the Foundation that these standards have served their purpose . . . . They should give place to more flexible, more individual, more exact and revealing standards of performance as rapidly as these may be achieved." Nevertheless, one still hears opposition to the "Carnegie Unit."

Unfortunately, the long drawn-out controversy over the "Carnegie Unit" has served through time to obscure the tremendously important role that the free pension program played in helping to define American higher education and in the evolution of pension programs generally. The changes made by a number of institutions to qualify for the pensions influenced other institutions in their states and regions and produced a general upgrading of higher education and also of secondary education as high schools sought to meet the new entrance standards.

Beyond this, the pensions themselves, in addition to their obvious importance to those who received them, did tend to "encourage, uphold and dignify the profession of the teacher," as phrased in the charter. Certainly they called public attention to the disgraceful way faculty members were

treated at the time and were an important milestone in the long road the teaching profession has had to travel in this century to gain the material rewards and the respect it now generally enjoys. From 1905 to June 30, 1979, the Foundation has disbursed $84,773,938 for free retiring allowances, disability allowances, and widows pensions to 6,255 beneficiaries in the United States and Canada. There are today 276 beneficiaries and widows of beneficiaries still living—one of whom is more than 100 years old. It is expected that benefits will continue to be paid past the turn of the century.

Furthermore, because the CFAT was primarily an organization concerned with the administration of a pension program, it set out rapidly to become a central repository of knowledge about pension programs generally. By 1930 it had made studies of some 688 public and private pension plans around the world, virtually all plans known to be in existence at the time. Out of these early studies, in a field of social policy that was still in its infancy, Mr. Pritchett distilled certain principles about pension management that are to be found in enlightened pension programs today and, indeed, are implicit in many of the provisions mandated in the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the federal legislation that set uniform standards for private pension administration in the nation. There is considerable evidence also to suggest that a direct line of influence can be traced from the Carnegie work in the pension field to the establishment of the U.S. Social Security System in the 1930s, although the definitive research necessary to verify this possibility has not been done.

Finally, not as a part of Mr. Carnegie's original purpose but somewhat serendipitously, the free pension program led to a development that proved to be of considerably greater importance to American higher education than the free pensions themselves. Early in the life of the program the trustees realized that the Foundation at some future date was not going to be able to meet its free pension commitments. A steady liberalization of the rules controlling the granting of pensions, expansion of the list of approved institutions, a rise in academic salaries (to which the pensions were pegged), and the increasing longevity of participants made it evident that the future financial burden on the Foundation was going to be much heavier than had been anticipated. Both Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Pritchett in addition had seen the need eventually for a contributory, self-supporting

10

scheme open to the thousands of employees in higher education who were not eligible for the Carnegie pensions.

In 1915, Mr. Pritchett produced a comprehensive plan for a general insurance and pension program open on a contributory basis to all college and university employees. This plan, together with a statement of principles on which any good pension program should rest, was published as Bulletin Number 9 of the Foundation in 1916. At the annual meeting that year the trustees set up the Commission on Insurance and Annuities to study the Pritchett plan. On it were six trustees and five representatives of major educational associations. Although Pritchett's plan had been greeted with considerable hostility in the American Association of University Professors and elsewhere in the higher educational world, the Commission's report in 1917 supported his views with some modifications and recommended the establishment, under New York State insurance law, of a nonprofit insurance and annuity association open (and limited) to all staff members of nonprofit educational institutions—colleges, universities, schools, foundations and research and scientific organizations. Shortly thereafter, on March 4, 1918, the Teachers Insurance Annuity Association (TIAA) was incorporated in New York. It was designed very much along the lines envisioned by Pritchett and recommended by the Commission.

The principles embodied in the new organization were fundamental to its acceptance by the academic community and to its eventual great success. These were: that retirement security should be a matter of joint responsibility between participants and their employers and both should contribute financially to it; that retirement annuities should be backed by a noncashable reserve fund which would be built up over time and would be adequate in size both to meet post-retirement benefits and to provide survivor benefits in the event of death before retirement; that the arrangement should be achieved through individual annuity contracts; and that the reserve fund should be vested at all times in the teachers themselves, and therefore be portable by them, thus ensuring them freedom to change jobs at any time without jeopardizing the contributions made by their employers to the pension fund. These principles are unchanged today and are still far ahead of other pension systems in protecting the rights of participants.

Mr. Pritchett became the first president of TIAA, continuing at the same time his presidency of the CFAT. Although TIAA was technically an independent organization, it was operated virtually as a department of the Foundation—for example its administrative costs that were not covered by the income on a $1 million endowment fund provided by Carnegie Corporation were for some years met by the Foundation or the Corporation. The nonprofit stock of the Association was owned outright by the Corporation until 1938, when it was transferred to an independent board of trustees to be held in trust for the participants. The TIAA had acquired its own full-time president in 1930, and, with the transfer of stock, its remaining formal ties with the two parent foundations were severed, although more than half of the $17 million that was granted to TIAA by the Foundation and Corporation, principally the latter, was after that date.

Soon after World War II, concern increasingly arose over the erosion through inflation of fixed-dollar retirement incomes. A new approach that linked retirement income more directly with growth of the economy was needed. The result was the chartering, in 1952, of an independent but closely associated organization, the College Retirement Equities Fund (CREF), managed under a contract with TIAA. This organization has from the outset invested almost entirely in common stocks and offers policyholders variable annuities expressed in "accumulation units" and "annuity units." Since participants may place all or none, or certain fractions, of their contributions in CREF, they may achieve such diversification of their pension reserve funds between fixed-dollar and equity investments as they themselves may choose. As the first experiment in variable annuities CREF was a bold innovation requiring considerable courage and determination to launch.

In 1956-57, with the help of substantial grants from the Ford Foundation, TIAA increased the attractiveness of its offerings by initiating two additional coverages, major medical insurance and total disability. It also offers individual and group life insurance plans that provide valuable further protection at minimal cost.

Initially fairly slow, the growth of TIAA, and since 1952 TIAA/CREF, has been phenomenal in recent decades. Although regarded by Mr. Pritchett as a "lusty infant" in the early 1920s, TIAA by 1931 had only

about 15,000 policyholders. By 1941 it had 36,000, by 1965, 200,000 TIAA/CREF policyholders and by 1979 635,000, located in some 3,200 educational institutions and other eligible organizations. Currently TIAA/CREF is paying benefits to some 82,000 retired persons or survivors of participants. Most impressive has been the growth in assets of the two organizations, which stand today at $7.8 billion for TIAA and $6 billion for CREF. This combined total of nearly $14 billion in funds for future benefits to participants and their families makes TIAA/CREF the seventh largest insurance company in the nation.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance to higher education of having available the well-rounded and relatively inexpensive benefit program which TIAA/CREF provides. It has been a significant factor in enabling colleges and universities to attract talented teachers and administrators, and it has contributed immeasurably to their mobility among institutions, thereby helping to build a sense of community within the academic worlds of the United States and Canada.

One cannot leave this first era of the CFAT's history without mentioning its program of educational studies, carried out at first with its surplus income and after 1913 under the auspices of its Division of Educational Enquiry, which Mr. Pritchett in that year had persuaded Mr. Carnegie to endow with $1,250,000 taken from the income of Carnegie Corporation. It will be recalled that in its Congressional charter of 1906, the Foundation in addition to its pension function was given a broad mandate to "do and perform all things necessary to encourage, uphold, and dignify the profession of the teacher and *the cause of higher education* . . . ." Within just four years, the Foundation, taking advantage of this subsidiary provision, organized and carried out one of the most influential educational studies ever made in the United States, the Flexner study of medical education.

Abraham Flexner, although not a physician himself, had formulated the criteria for a first-class medical school, aided by a few leading physicians such as Dr. William H. Welch and the example of the nation's best school, Johns Hopkins. With these criteria in mind and the support of both the Council on Medical Education and the newly organized Association of American Medical Colleges, he then visited every medical school in the nation (over 150), finding virtually all of them sadly de-

ficient and many scandalously so. Reporting his findings without compromise, he aroused much antagonism, but also a great wave of concern both in the medical profession and among the public. The result was a sharp raising of standards by the profession and the closing of about half of the country's medical schools. This was accompanied by a dramatic outpouring of funds for medical education and research, much of it coming from the General Education Board, which had been established not long before then by John D. Rockefeller, and some from Carnegie Corporation on Pritchett's recommendations.

Improved medical education in time produced better medical practice, which proved to be an important factor in increased life expectancy, from about 45 just prior to the Flexner study to about 70 fifty years later. Greater longevity at that stage of our national development, when many people died before they had completed their prime working years, had an enormous effect in its turn on national productivity. While one must be careful not to overstate a cause and effect relationship between the Flexner study and the great economic growth of succeeding decades, since obviously many other factors were involved, some such linkage is certainly warranted. In any event, although the reforms stimulated by Flexner gradually led to such a rigidifying of medical education that he himself became disillusioned, and although the form this training took became so narrowly specialized it was no longer capable of meeting all of the diverse health care needs of the nation, these developments should not be allowed to depreciate the significance of the study. It stands today as a superb achievement and one of which the CFAT can always be proud.

While the Flexner study was the most important educational enquiry organized by the Foundation in the period from 1905 to about 1930, there were other projects of major significance. Among these were studies of engineering education by Charles R. Mann, published in 1918; of dental education by William T. Gies in 1926 and of college athletics by Howard J. Savage in 1929. Studies in the legal field produced *Justice and the Poor*, by Reginald Heber Smith in 1918; *Training for the Public Profession of Law*, by Alfred Z. Reed in 1921; *Present Day Law Schools*, also by Reed, in 1928 and annual reviews of legal education by Reed from 1928 through 1935. Among these, the Savage study of college athletics received wide publicity, although few steps were taken by higher education

to correct the abuses he documented. The studies of legal education by Smith and Reed were perceptive, far-sighted pieces of work and probably deserve to be better known today than they are. The study of engineering education led, in due course, to an important development in that field, the founding of the Engineers' Council for Professional Development.

Other studies of that period dealt with vocational education, teacher training and graduate education. There were also a number of more specific studies directed at particular states, such as the highly controversial study of education in Vermont done at the request of public authorities in that state in 1912.

Finally, in its first era, the Foundation, having amassed a huge body of knowledge and data about education throughout the nation, frequently found itself being asked for advice on problems confronting educational administrators in the states and in particular localities. The development of an informal and highly useful consultative service thus became a natural concomitant of the Foundation's program of educational studies.

Retrenchment and Decline, 1930-1966

Indications of impending financial difficulties for the Foundation were not long in coming. By 1915 it was clear to Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Pritchett that the Foundation could not possibly ever provide enough free pensions to satisfy all who would qualify for them, and, indeed, might not even be able to meet its commitments in regard to pensions already granted. In that year the trustees of Carnegie Corporation asked all the other Carnegie organizations to study their programs and estimate the sums needed in the future to carry out their plans. Replying for the CFAT, Pritchett said that plans for a new contributory pension program were already afoot but there might be a short period of ten to fifteen years during which the Foundation would need modest additional funds from the Corporation to meet its responsibilities in regard to the old free pensions. It would also need about $500,000 to establish TIAA.

By 1917 these estimates had gone up considerably, and, after considerable negotiation between the two organizations, the Corporation eventually committed $13 million to the Foundation: $1 million to establish TIAA, $5 million to set up a reserve fund to meet future commitments for free pensions, a further $6 million to be paid into the reserve

fund at the rate of $600,000 annually for ten years, and a final $1 million, payable $200,000 a year for five years to be put into a special account for teachers at colleges not then associated with the Foundation. These grants were made on condition that the CFAT change the rules as necessary from time to time to prevent the obligations to teachers on its 1915 list exceeding available resources.

By 1923 Andrew Carnegie had died, James Angell had served for one year as president of the Corporation, Mr. Pritchett had filled in for two years as acting president in addition to his CFAT duties, and Frederick Keppel had become president. His ascendency to the Corporation's leadership marked a clear change in its relationship with the other Carnegie philanthropies, including the CFAT, because he wanted the Corporation to develop a program of its own rather than serve primarily as a funding agency for the other organizations. Keppel therefore quickly became concerned about the possibility of additional future deficits at the CFAT and in 1925 asked for information about its future situation. Pritchett, reacting somewhat resentfully at what he regarded as unwarranted interference, replied that the CFAT would ask for nothing then, would make new estimates of its future requirements and perhaps ask for a loan some ten years hence. He made it clear that the CFAT would handle its own affairs.

Nevertheless, within a few months Keppel brought the problem to the attention of the Corporation's executive committee and got it to authorize the appointment in 1926 of a committee of actuaries to assess the size of the Foundation's future pension load. He also wrote to Pritchett that the Corporation was concerned about the many new names added to the pension list since 1915. Pritchett replied in some pique saying this time that as long as he was president the Foundation would never ask for another penny from the Corporation. When the CFAT's income could no longer meet its obligations it would defer payment to those who became newly eligible for pensions until someone died. The professors would simply have to wait.

Later in the year a proposal by Pritchett to his board that the maximum size of pensions be reduced from $3,600 to $1,800 caused it to set up a special trustee committee to review the resources and prospective expenditures of the Foundation. A year later the committee reported that the reductions seemed necessary if the CFAT had to rely on its own resources,

but it requested authority to bring the situation formally to the attention of the Corporation. Meeting with Keppel in early 1928 the committee came to the rather drastic conclusion that the Foundation was morally obligated to divide up its capital among the associated colleges and universities in order to enable them to meet all *future* pension commitments. Keppel abetted this proposed solution by agreeing to take to his executive committee a recommendation that the Corporation provide $600,000 per year for nine years to help cover the cost of *current* pensions.

When Pritchett, spending the winter in Santa Barbara, as was his usual custom, heard about this proposal he was livid. Writing to Professor Mackenzie of the University of Toronto, one of the actuaries who had studied the pension load for Keppel and concurred in the division of capital idea, he unleashed this fine bit of biting irony:

> The complaint that the opinions of the beneficiary institutions have not been fairly considered is groundless. Please look up the Eleventh Report and the account of the long conferences with the associated institutions and, at their suggestion, with the Association of University Professors. The dark intimations about a possible public protest on the part of some of the beneficiary institutions, if their views are not followed, you certainly do not expect me to take seriously.
>
> I am doing you the justice to regard these two expressions as the outcome of a temporary actuarial indisposition due to your kindly labors on our behalf and not the result of your usually serene judgment. I trust you are now feeling better.

To the trustee committee and to Keppel he shot off angry letters saying that the proposal to divide up the CFAT's endowment was a clear breach of trust and was unthinkable. Seeking legal counsel, the committee was advised that the Court would probably approve the proposal, *provided that the vote of the trustees was unanimous*. Knowing this could never be the case with Pritchett being an *ex officio* member of the board, the committee decided to back off and find some other solution. But, therefore, for the stubbornness of Henry Pritchett the CFAT would probably have ended its life in 1928, and its modern period of useful service would never have come about. It was a close call!

Continuing negotiations between the two foundations led to an agree-

ment in 1929 when the Corporation pledged itself to set aside $5,400,000 over a nine-year period to provide supplementary annuities through TIAA of $500 a year at age 70 for those on the Foundation's list who became 65 in 1931 and thereafter. The CFAT, for its part, agreed to make progressive cuts in its pensions over the next nine years, to the end that a professor retiring at 70 in 1937 or thereafter would get a maximum pension of only $1,000 (about $5,000 in today's terms), supplemented by the $500 from the Corporation through TIAA.

But even these measures did not solve the problem. New estimates in 1937 revealed that the deficit on the free pension commitments would be at least $17 million. A joint committee of the two boards thereupon came up with a new plan under which the CFAT would borrow from its own general endowment fund until the value of the fund was reduced to its original $10 million level, and the Corporation would lend to the Foundation without interest the balance required up to a maximum of $15 million. This plan was approved by the Court in November 1939, was put into operation and in fact at long last did provide a permanent solution to the long-term difficulties which had arisen from Mr. Carnegie's generous and well-meaning but seriously underfunded gesture in behalf of the academic profession. Although the pensions have been increased very modestly in recent years, they remain today essentially at the level set in 1929. They are, of course, only supplementary to retirement income received by the beneficiaries from other sources.

Henry Pritchett retired in 1930 and was succeeded by Henry Suzzallo, a former president of the University of Washington. After his untimely death only three years later Walter Jessup, president of the University of Iowa, took over the Foundation's leadership. Although both were able men and the Foundation continued to maintain a position of some influence throughout the decade of the thirties, its basic financial problem was gradually eroding both its strength and independence. After Frederick Keppel's retirement in 1941, Jessup became president of the Corporation as well as of the Foundation, but this temporary arrangement was terminated by his sudden death in 1944. The War years, with many of the staff away, were ones of considerably reduced activity for both foundations.

After the war, in 1945, Devereux Josephs moved from the TIAA presidency to the presidency of the Corporation and Oliver Carmichael be-

came president of the CFAT, serving also as a senior officer on the Corporation's staff. When Josephs left in 1948 he was succeeded by Charles Dollard, Carmichael continuing to work for both organizations until his departure in 1953. Major initiatives could be taken in those post-war years only if the Corporation was willing to fund them, with the result that the Foundation was slowly becoming a Corporation dependent, thus reversing the historic position in which the CFAT had been regarded as the more influential and prestigious of the two foundations. Carmichael's personal influence in higher educational matters was, however, considerable. For example, in the mid-1940s he served on the planning commission for the proposed State University of New York, playing a key role in the complex and protracted negotiations with the Regents required to bring the new institution into being. Subsequently, he was appointed by Governor Dewey to be the first chairman of the University's board of trustees.

At its November 1952 meeting, the CFAT board decided to appoint a special committee to study the policy, program and operation of the Foundation, with particular reference to its future. Since such a study would inevitably involve the Corporation, the enabling resolution asked its trustees to appoint a special committee also to confer with the CFAT committee. The decision of Oliver Carmichael early in 1953 to resign from the presidency of the CFAT to become president of the University of Alabama made the work of the two committees more urgent, since a new president could not be recruited until major decisions were made about the Foundation's future.

A tentative plan drawn up by the chairmen of the two special committees was rejected by the CFAT trustees on the grounds that it did not give the Foundation sufficient independence. The board then came forward with a plan of its own that called for the Foundation to have its own officers and quarters and to receive an annual subsidy from the Corporation for ten years to supplement the very limited uncommitted income available to it annually. The Corporation's trustees rejected this proposal forthwith—partly on the grounds that it compromised the very independence that the CFAT's board was so eager to attain—and suggested instead that the Foundation seek a Court order to borrow more of its own capital to meet future needs. This decision and proposal were re-

ceived with considerable disappointment and even anger by the Foundation's board, and relations between the two organizations, strained for some years, deteriorated further.

In the face of this decision it was clear that, absent the Court order it was unwilling to seek, the CFAT was not in a position to recruit a full-time president to carry out an independent program. It therefore had no alternative but to propose that the Corporation's officers assume responsibility for managing the Foundation's affairs. John Gardner, recently appointed acting president of the Corporation, thus became acting president of the Foundation in 1954 and in 1955 president of both organizations, and I succeeded him in 1965. The arrangement wherein one set of officers runs both foundations has continued to the present but, as we have seen, will come to a close very shortly.

Although the years from about 1930 to 1966 were ones of retrenchment and gradual decline in the CFAT's affairs, they were not lacking in some significant achievements. One of these successes would certainly be the so-called Pennsylvania Study, which was reported in 1938 in a Foundation Bulletin entitled *The Student and His Knowledge* and in subsequent publications. Under the direction of William S. Learned and Ben D. Wood, the study documented the weakness of the course credit system in measuring academic progress and gave a great deal of impetus and respectability to objective testing as a means of measuring educational attainment.

Another important Foundation project of the 1930s was the development in 1937, with Corporation financial support, of the Graduate Record Examinations. Devised to meet the need for an efficient means of determining whether students were qualified for graduate study and predicting how well they would perform at it, these examinations have been immensely useful to universities in sorting out their graduate school admissions. They were administered by the Foundation itself until 1947 when the CFAT, the College Entrance Examination Board and the Cooperative Test Service of the American Council on Education, with the encouragement of a substantial grant from Carnegie Corporation through the Foundation, merged their testing activities to form the Educational Testing Service.

In addition to these major projects, the years from 1930 to 1941 were marked by the funding of a considerable number of smaller projects.

These were generally the result of proposals which had been made to the Corporation but were referred to the Foundation for advice and possible funding out of an annual subvention of about $100,000 made by the Corporation to the CFAT. Many of these projects were in the fields of testing and fine arts teaching, reflecting Frederick Keppel's interests. Some larger projects were funded outside the annual allocation and often received supplementary support directly from the Corporation as well. These included an international examinations enquiry and studies of the teaching of modern languages and of English as a second language.

In the early thirties the Foundation supported studies of higher education in the South which revealed clearly the low quality of most institutions in that part of the country and the drain of talent from them to other areas. These studies laid the basis for two major post-war projects administered by the Foundation and financed by the Corporation. One of there was a program of grants-in-aid for faculty members of southern institutions, totaling $980,000, of which $235,000 was reserved for the faculty of black colleges. The other was a program to strengthen graduate education in the South, in which grants totaling $1,200,000 were made to five southern universities.

From 1950 to 1965 occasional projects were launched as sufficient income accumulated in the Division of Educational Enquiry to make these possible. They included a study by Harold Dodds of the academic presidency, a study of relationships between higher education and the federal government, a study of student values by Theodore Newcomb, a study of student activists by Richard Flacks and a survey by Earl McGrath and Richard Brick on innovations in liberal education.

The only other activity by the Foundation in the years from 1956 to 1966 was the publication each year by the president of an essay based on a discussion by the trustees at the previous annual meeting of a major topic in higher education. Few of these caused any stir, although one of them, *The Flight From Teaching*, in 1964, received wide public attention. Some of the discussions were preceded by substantial commissioned papers, the most valuable of which were those prepared for the 1970 meeting by Fritz Machlup, Walter P. Metzger and Richard H. Sullivan, published as CFAT Bulletin Number 34 under the title *Neutrality or Partisanship: A Dilemma of Academic Institutions.*

Revitalization, 1966-1979

In the late 1950s John Gardner and James Perkins, then president and vice president, respectively, of both the Corporation and the Foundation discussed the possibility of trying to merge the two organizations and in 1959 even obtained a detailed opinion from legal counsel as to the possibility of doing so.

Again, in the years from 1963 to 1965, when I was vice president of the two organizations and Gardner still president, we had lengthy discussions about the future of the Foundation, seriously considering two possible courses of action, either terminating its life outright or merging it with the Corporation. Its fortunes were at such a low ebb at the time there was a good question as to whether it should continue to be an independent organization. Mr. Gardner, however, went on leave to become Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (resigning from the Corporation in 1967) before we had decided what, if any, recommendation to make to the trustees, and the problem fell into my lap.

It was not long before I was forced to make up my mind about what I personally believed should be the Foundation's future. This decision was precipitated by the fact that in 1966 the CFAT, thanks to a gradually decreasing pension load, was to have surplus income beyond that needed to meet its pension commitments and would be in a position to start repaying its loans under the 1938 agreement, which had mounted to $14,600,000 from the Corporation and $6,473,088 from its own endowment fund. The question was whether this lengthy process, which would last into the next century and extend that long the CFAT's minimal activity should simply be allowed to take place, or whether some other financial arrangement, with different implications for the Foundation's future, should be devised, including a possible decision to end its existence and contract with TIAA to administer the balance of the free pensions.

Faced with this choice, I concluded that this lingering existence was in nobody's interest and that the CFAT should be given a fair chance to find out if there was a useful role for it in the new age that had been ushered in by the enormous expansion of higher education in the 1950s and 1960s. It seemed wrong to me to make a precipitous decision about its future in view of its long and distinguished history and because its unique charter made it the only foundation in the country, as far as I knew, exclusively

devoted to advancing the welfare of higher education. This was an important mission and one that presented an intriguing challenge.

Fortunately, both the Corporation's and the Foundation's boards agreed with this view. It was impossible, because of the 1939 Court Order, for the Corporation simply to forgive repayment of its loan, so it offered instead to return to the Foundation each year in the form of a grant the amount repaid to it. The Foundation's trustees pointed out, however, that at least initially the sums involved would be too small to accomplish anything significant. The Corporation then agreed to consider an annual request from the Foundation for funding of a major project, making it clear that such requests would have to compete with proposals from other prospective grantees in the normal manner.

The Foundation's trustees, accordingly, were invited to submit ideas for a major educational study. When a number of them took the view that the most important problem of the moment was the financing of higher education, this topic was selected at the annual meeting on November 16, 1966, and was approved for funding by the Corporation's trustees on January 19, 1967. Between those dates I approached Clark Kerr, then president of the University of California, to find out if he would be willing to be chairman of the special commission that was to make the study. The appointment was to be of a public service nature, part-time and unpaid.

In accepting, Mr. Kerr made the point that he could see no way of studying the financing of higher education without looking more broadly at its structure and functions. We agreed, and the project was then designated the Carnegie Commission to Study the Future Structure, Functions, and Financing of Higher Education, soon shortened to the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, and not long after that to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Commission was to be an *ad hoc* body fully independent of both foundations and was to have a limited life of five years—which stretched eventually to six. Over that period support for it from Carnegie Corporation, through the Foundation, came to nearly $6 million.

In early January, shortly after accepting the chairmanship of the Commission, Mr. Kerr was relieved from the University of California presidency by the regents, giving him the opportunity to make his famous quip that he "entered the presidency fired with enthusiasm and left the same way."

While this was a severe blow to the University and the State, it was an unexpected piece of good fortune for the CFAT, because he was then available to commit himself to the Commission on a virtually full-time, salaried basis, as chairman and executive director. As it turned out, the fact that Mr. Kerr was able to give leadership to the enterprise in both roles was probably more than anything else responsible for its great success.

Initially, the Commission's membership consisted of fourteen men and women, selected for their known ability, experience, judgment, objectivity, and interest in higher education. At the time of their appointment six of the members, Nathan Pusey, David Henry, William Friday, James Perkins, Katherine McBride and Theodore Hesburgh, were college and university presidents and also CFAT trustees; one, Joseph Cosand, was the head of a junior college district; one, David Riesman, was a professor; one, Carl Kaysen, was the head of a research institute; one, William Scranton, was a former state governor; one, Roy Larsen, was a publisher; and three, Ralph Besse, Norton Simon and Clifton Phalen, were businessmen who were also college or university trustees. In time, however, the Commission itself began to feel the need for additional experience in its deliberations and five other persons were added—the deans of two predominantly black law schools, Patricia Harris and Kenneth Tollett, the president of a four-year state college, Stanley Heywood, a professor of psychology on a medical school faculty, Kenneth Keniston, and a British authority on international higher education, Lord Ashby. Meanwhile, one member, Roy Larsen, had resigned for health reasons making a final membership of 19, including the chairman, Mr. Kerr.

Quarters for the Commission were obtained in Berkeley, California, and a staff recruited. Among the many able and devoted men and women who worked for the Commission and subsequently for the Carnegie Council on Higher Education, the three associate directors, Margaret Gordon, Verne Stadtman and Virginia Smith deserve special recognition. Their contribution to both enterprises has been truly immeasurable.

The Commission quickly laid out eight aspects of higher education with which it would be concerned: functions, structure, governance, innovation and change, demand, expenditure, available resources and effective use of resources. It decided, further, that it would have several distinct types of activities: the commissioning of a variety of research studies and publication of their results; the commissioning and publication in book form of

a series of descriptive profiles of parts of the higher educational system and of some of its functions; the commissioning and publication of a series of reflective essays on American higher education by American and foreign observers; the preparation and issuance of a number of Commission reports; and the initiation of a variety of activities, including conferences, meetings and press briefings, designed to inform both relevant officials and the public at large of the Commission's work.

Early in the Commission's life the question arose of its relationship to higher education and in particular to the national associations and organizations representing higher education in Washington. Both the CFAT and the Commission were quite clear on the issue—the Commission had been created to speak *about* higher education to the American people, to their elected and appointed officials and to the academic community itself. In no sense was it to be an advocate *for* higher education or feel that its recommendations should necessarily conform to the positions being taken by the official representatives of higher education. At times the Commission's independence caused considerable strain between it and organized higher education, especially over the issue of the form which federal aid to higher education should take, but the reliability of its information and the objectivity of its recommendations soon came to be widely respected and enabled it to acquire a position of very considerable influence.

It is difficult in brief compass to summarize the achievements of the Commission. One can, of course, point to its publications—the 23 Commission reports, the 60 sponsored research reports, and 23 technical reports. In the breadth of their coverage, in the quality of the research they reported, in the sheer mass of data they presented, and in the astuteness of judgment they revealed they unquestionably constituted the most comprehensive and most important body of descriptive and analytical literature about higher education that had ever been produced in this or any other country. Not all of these publications were widely read, of course, although some were, and some of them received considerable press coverage. Generally, they were useful to a selective audience concerned directly with the development of public policy toward higher education, with the administration of institutions or with higher education as a field of professional study.

Important as the Commission's output was, there is, however, the

larger question of how influential its work actually was both in the development of public policy toward higher education and in what happened within the academic world itself. This is not a question that can be easily answered in a definitive manner. Some of the recommendations were clearly enormously influential in the shaping of public policy, for example in the establishment in 1972 of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, (BEOGs) a program of national student awards based solely on need, in both the size and nature of federal support of medical education, in establishment of the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education, a governmental foundation to encourage innovation and change in higher education, and in additional ways. Others of its recommendations were moderately influential and some probably of very little influence.

In all, it would be no exaggeration to say that the Commission, through its reports and through the critically important testimony and advice given on request by Clark Kerr and other staff members to federal and state officials, directly influenced the spending of several *billions* of dollars of public funds for higher education, at least $2.4 billion for the BEOGs program alone. This was no mean return for the investment of just six *million* dollars of foundation money and proved, certainly to my satisfaction, that despite the massive movement of government into areas that were once a private responsibility, there continues to be an important role for private foundations generally, and specifically in higher education for The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

More difficult to assess is the influence of the Carnegie Commission on policy and practice within the academic enterprise—that is, on specific campuses. There is considerable evidence that most senior administrators were familiar with the Commission's recommendations and took them into consideration in their work, but it is doubtful the recommendations were of much influence with most faculty members or students, at least directly. One report, however, *Less Time, More Options*, issued in 1971, did have a very large impact on the academic community generally in helping to break down unnecessary structural rigidities in the system and popularize the notion that higher education should be available flexibly to all who seek it when they want it throughout their lifetimes. So far has higher education gone in the decade of the '70s in making flexible and imaginative adjustments to meet the needs of a wide variety of students,

Less Time, More Options may strike the reader now as almost hackneyed, and yet when it first appeared it was a radical document.

The Commission was severely criticized in some quarters for being too much concerned with such issues as governance, administration, structure, functions, financing, and enrollments and too little concerned with "substance"—that is with the content of curriculum. While this seemed a valid comment to some people at the time, it was hardly fair criticism, since the Commission's work directly reflected the assignment given to it by the Foundation. In a way the Commission was a victim of its own output, which was so prodigious it created the impression that the Commission's terms of reference were as broad as higher education itself. Neglect of the curriculum was therefore bound to seem like a failing, although in actuality the Commission had never been asked and had never intended to tackle this subject.

Possibly the most important aspect of the Commission's entire effort was the conspicuous attention it devoted to equality of opportunity in higher education. While this was a general theme running through much of its work, the Commission dealt with it specifically in eleven of its twenty-three reports: *Quality and Equality*, 1968; *A Chance to Learn*, 1970; *The Open-Door Colleges*, 1970; *Quality and Equality (Revised Recommendations)*, 1970; *Higher Education and the Nation's Health*, 1970; *Less Time, More Options*, 1971; *From Isolation to Mainstream*, 1971; *New Students and New Places*, 1971; *Institutional Aid*, 1972; *Opportunities for Women in Higher Education*, 1973; and the final report, *Priorities for Action*, 1973. There can be little doubt that the analyses and recommendations of the Commission contributed significantly to the development of new public and private policies in the late sixties and early seventies that provided the impetus for major advances toward the goal of equal opportunity.

So successful was the Commission it was apparent to the board by 1971 that the CFAT, as its sponsor, did indeed have an important role to play in the new era of American higher education and should continue to exist. To facilitate the Foundation's work some important organizational and financial steps were therefore taken.

In its earliest days the Foundation's board of 25 trustees consisted almost exclusively of college and university presidents, who remained on the

board indefinitely. This was modified in 1958 so that the membership of trustees who were presidents of institutions would cease automatically when they left their presidencies; and the few nonacademic trustees would retire at age 70. At its annual meeting in November 1971, the board adopted new bylaws which provided for much wider representation both from within the academic community and outside of it and established a maximum board tenure of two four-year terms and an age limit of 70 years for all members. The board also decided it should hold a spring meeting each year as well as the annual fall meeting in order more fully to meet its responsibilities.

On the financial side, the board, with the enthusiastic concurrence of the Corporation's trustees, petitioned the Supreme Court of New York State to nullify that part of the Court Order of 1939 requiring the Foundation to repay its borrowings from its own endowment fund and from Carnegie Corporation, and also to be allowed, under a provision of the New York State Not-For-Profit Corporation Law, to spend realized capital gains as income. Both requests were granted by the Court in May 1972, and the CFAT, after more than three decades of restricted control over its own affairs, thus regained its financial independence. It could now anticipate unencumbered income, beyond the requirements of the free pension program, of better than $1 million annually.

A third important step was taken the following year, 1973, with the creation of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education as an integral part of the CFAT and its principal operating arm. The Council was seen not simply as a successor to the Commission but as one of several possible devices through which the Foundation itself would become an organization exclusively (except for administration of the remaining free pensions) concerned with policy issues in the field of higher education. To give structural effect to this arrangement a majority of the Council's membership was to be drawn from the CFAT board and the CFAT's president was to be an *ex officio* member. The Council began its work in early 1974, again under the chairmanship and direction of Clark Kerr.

The exact relationship of the Council to the board of the Foundation, though technically clear, in actuality presented a dilemma. On the one hand, the Council, if it was to be effective, would have to make public pronouncements in its own name, and it was therefore given this authority. On the other hand, this would create at least the appearance of committing

trustees who did not happen also to be Council members to positions they had not participated in defining. On the face of it, the contradiction was unresolvable, but it has in fact led to no difficulties. The Council soon began to issue reports in its own name and quickly acquired the same reputation for independence as the Commission. Despite what had been intended, it has, therefore, been generally regarded by the public as a direct successor to the Commission.

A second activity of the Foundation in the policy area under the 1973 plan was to be an annual commentary by the entire board of trustees on some major issue in higher education, with preparatory work to be done by the Council. Three of these commentaries have now been issued, as follows: *More Than Survival: Prospects for Higher Education in a Period of Uncertainty*, 1975; *The States and Higher Education: A Proud Past and a Vital Future*, 1976; *Missions of the College Curriculum: A Contemporary Review with Suggestions*, 1977.

The Council itself over the nearly six years of its life has issued 14 reports (including the commentaries mentioned above) and has published seven sponsored research reports and 23 technical reports. The reports have been on such topics as the federal role in post-secondary education, tuition policy, affirmative action, medical and dental education, federal reorganization in relation to the proposal to establish a department of education, collective bargaining, selective admissions, the states and private higher education, fair practices and student financial aid. A final report reviewing where the nation stands today in higher education and suggesting what must be acomplished by the end of the century is in preparation.

Membership in the Council in the period from 1973 to the present has varied from nine to fifteen persons, with a total participation of twenty men and women drawn from academic institutions, educational organizations, foundations and business. Like the Commission members before them, they have been an extraordinarily hard-working and devoted group with a strong sense of responsibility toward their task. Like the Commission again, they have debated the drafts of their reports page by page and even paragraph by paragraph and not a sentence in the reports lacks the mark of their close scrutiny.

In accordance with new bylaws adopted in 1973, a majority of the Council's members have at all times been CFAT trustees. They have included, in addition to Clark Kerr and myself *(ex officio)*, E.K. Fretwell,

Rosemary Park, James Perkins, Pauline Tompkins, Clifton Wharton, Ernest Boyer, Margaret MacVicar, Joseph Platt, Stephen Spurr, Nell Eurich, Daniel Evans, Frank Newman and Robert O'Neil. Non-trustee members have included Nolen Ellison, William Van Alstyne, William Bowen, Lois Rice, and William Roth.

On balance the reports issued by the Council have tended to be somewhat longer and more heavily researched than those of the Commission and several—for example, *Missions of the College Curriculum,* 1977, and a report on youth which is about to be published—have been major undertakings. The latter project has included a series of comparative studies of education and youth employment in Japan, Mexico and South Asia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, Great Britain, Poland and Sweden and Denmark, the results of which were published as Council technical reports. The report itself, which examines youth needs and opportunities in this country in regard to education, employment and service will undoubtedly prove to be one of the most important publications either the Council or the Commission before it has ever issued.

The Council's work on the curriculum, an area with which, as we have seen, the Commission did not concern itself, has been particularly valuable to colleges and universities and has appealed to numbers of faculty members as well as administrators. The work includes not only the Council's own report, mentioned above, but also a superb book by the historian, Frederick Rudolph, entitled *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since* 1636, published in 1977.

Two Council reports that deserve particular mention are *Selective Admissions in Higher Education: Comment and Recommendations and Two Reports,* 1977, and *Fair Practices in Higher Education: Rights and Responsibilities of Students and their Colleges in a Period of Intensified Competition for Enrollment,* 1979. The first of these tackled the thorny question of how the dual objectives of recognizing merit and meeting affirmative action goals can be fairly and honestly reconciled in admissions to selective institutions at the graduate level. It was cited in the Supreme Court's 1978 decision in the case of the Regents of the University of California V. Allan Bakke. The second is proving to be a most helpful guide and reference book to institutions trying to cope with the multitude of ethical issues that are to be found in higher education today.

With the anticipated retirement of Clark Kerr at the end of 1979 the

board decided in 1977 that the time had come for a deliberate and careful look at the future of the Foundation. To this end, at the spring meeting it set up a special planning committee under the chairmanship of the board chairman, E.K. Fretwell Jr. This committee in the course of its work sought advice in writing from a large number of qualified persons and received many thoughtful and well-informed replies. On the basis of the advice obtained and its own deliberations, the committee formulated a set of important recommendations for consideration by the full board at its annual meeting in November 1977, as follows:

- the primary mission of the Foundation should continue to be the improvement of policy within, and externally toward, higher education.
- Activities should include research, publication, dissemination, and consultation, all designed to lead to action.
- Only a limited number of major policy issues should be attacked at a given time.
- The board should remain at its present size of 25 members and should be widely representative both of higher education and of the public at large.
- There should be a full-time president and staff to carry out the program agreed to by the board.
- The present Council on Policy Studies should be terminated at the end of 1979, with the president free thereafter to determine the new mechanism most appropriate to give effect to the program.
- The new president, with the concurrence of the board, should be free to locate the Foundation wherever seemed most appropriate.
- A search committee should be appointed and report in time for a new president to be elected at the annual meeting in November 1978, to take office some time in 1979.

After full discussion, these recommendations were unanimously approved by the board and became the basis for a number of actions in the two succeeding years, including, most importantly, the election of Ernest Boyer to the presidency, his resignation as Commissioner of Education in June 1979, preparations for him to take office at the close of the annual meeting in November of that year, and preliminary planning by him of a new program for the Foundation to take effect in 1980.

As this report goes to the printer the Carnegie Council on Policy

Studies in Higher Education, with about four months of its life remaining, still has several important publications to complete, including its final report. It is probably too early to judge the Council's overall record of accomplishment, although clearly several of its reports have been highly influential, and its youth report, as already suggested, may well, over time, have a considerable impact on national policy.

For several reasons the Council and predecessor Commission really cannot be compared, most importantly because the higher educational contexts for their work differed so strikingly. The period from 1967 to 1973 started when the glow of higher education's golden age was still strong but was principally characterized by campus activism, student unrest, Vietnam protest, and radical changes in national values and personal lifestyles that much affected campus life. The period from 1973 to 1979, on the other hand, has been one of financial retrenchment, budgetary stringency, declining optimism and growing conservatism on the campus, a period in which both the will and the capacity for experimentation have been seriously diminished. Each body, perforce, adjusted to the circumstances of its times in order to avoid apparent, and perhaps real, irrelevance, and for each of them their work with this short-range perspective was significant in respect to the issues and opportunities of the day.

On the other hand, much of the work of both bodies had a long-range perspective and will, I firmly believe, have enduring value. Higher education is now an immense enterprise in our national life, affecting in one way or another the lives of virtually all of us. It is of central importance to the nation's security, to its economic progress and to its quality of life. The undertaking, therefore, by the Commission and the Council to contribute to the strengthening of higher education by the clarification of policy within it and the improvement of public policy toward it has been an effort well worth making. I can testify that in each case it has been a tenacious and determined effort by Clark Kerr and his colleagues, pursued with a high sense of conscience and with total integrity. One can ask no more.

Alan Piper

ALAN PIPER, *President*